Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	**Application No.** 10/621,067	**Applicant(s)** FARKAS ET AL.	
	Examiner KENNETH TANG	**Art Unit** 2195	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _Amendment after non-final_

  (1) _KENNETH TANG_.   (3) _____.

  (2) _Dan C. Hu (Reg. No. 40,025)_.   (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _15 July 2010_   **Time:** _2pm_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No
  If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
_NA_

Claims discussed:
1, 7, 20, 25, and 29

Prior art documents discussed:
_NA_

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview
  directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance
  of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview
  did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
An interview was conducted to determine amendments to the claims that would place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner proposed the following amendment that would place independent claim 29 in condition for allowance, but an agreement was not made by the Applicant:

29. A method for operating multiple processor cores, comprising:
  obtaining a throughput metric that identifies throughput achieved by computer processor cores on a single semiconductor die as a function of workloads running on said computer processor cores, the complexities of the processor cores, and the sizes of the processor cores; and
  initially assigning a plurality of computer processing jobs amongst the computer processor cores based on the throughput metric and any static assignments, wherein at least two of the computer processor cores differ in size or complexity but execute the same instruction set;
  transferring the computer processing jobs to a new assignment of a computer processor core amongst the computer processor cores;
  collecting statistics about execution performance of the computer processing jobs at the new assignment;
  building a data structure with relative performances of the computer processing jobs on the initially assigned computer processor core and the transferred computer processor core based on the statistics collected, wherein the data structure is used to reassign the computer processing jobs ;
  determining whether a benefit is gained to reassign the computer processing jobs back to the first computer processor core or a different computer processor cores based on the data structure collected; and
  reassigning the computer processing job based on the benefit and the statistiscs collected.

The Examiner notes that the support for the amended claims can be found on pages 11, 15, and 16 of the specification.